

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

RYAN MASTERS,

Defendant.


Case No. 2:12-cr-00145-MMD-GWF

ORDER

Before the Court is Defendant Ryan Masters’ Motion for Exemption from Local Rule 10-6(a). (Dkt. no. 157.) The identical motion is docketed as a “Motion for Appointment of Co-Counsel. (Dkt. no. 158). Defendant has been appointed counsel. While Defendant contends his counsel has not been able to “complete motions or other related matters . . . in an effort to maintain timeliness of progress” in this case, the Court finds that such a reason, even if true, does not warrant exemption from Local Rule 10-6(a). The Court further notes that counsel may not have “complete[d] motions” if there is no valid motion to file.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED the Defendant’s identical Motions for Exemption from Local Rule IA 10-6(a) docketed as nos. 157 and 158 are DENIED.

DATED THIS 8th day of April 2013.



MIRANDA M. DU
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE